

REMARKS

Claims 40, 52, 60 and 61 have been amended. Claims 1-25 and 41-51 have been canceled without prejudice of disclaimer. Claims 40, 52 and 54-61 are pending in this application. No new matter is presented in this amendment.

Claims 1-7, 12-20, 25, 40-45, 52, 54 and 60-61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nonomura et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,915,067. Claims 1-7, 12-20, 25, and 41-45 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; the rejection of these claims is thus moot. The applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

Nonomura discloses a information storage medium having a plurality of video title sets including program chain information (FIGS. 5, 7), which allow the information storage medium to store information about different branches of video data, enabling a parental lock function whereby a different video may be reproduced (col. 11, lines 24-26.) The information storage medium includes a plurality of video title sets (FIG. 7; col. 10, lines 22-23), each including a plurality of video objects and a plurality of program chains (col. 11, lines 22-24.) A program chain (PGC) is a list of VOBs in a given reproduction order (col. 11, lines 22-25). Each program chain also has corresponding attribute information included in the video object title set (col. 11, lines 13-15), referred to as an attribute table. The attribute information includes a level ID, which may be a parental lock level or a PGC version type (col. 12, lines 61-64).

In contrast, claim 40 recites, in part, title information, which corresponds to the at least one title, wherein the title information comprises title access type information indicating whether title search to the corresponding title is permitted.

Nonomura does not disclose all the elements of claim 40. For example, Nonomura does not disclose title information, which corresponds to the at least one title, and comprising title access type information indicating whether title search to the corresponding title is permitted. The Examiner construes the title as corresponding to "a group of at least one VOB played in a set order determined by the PGC", and the attribute information as corresponding to the program chain attributes.

An Examiner may rely upon a reference to disclose everything that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that reference to disclose. See MPEP § 2123(I) and the

cases cited therein. Here, Nonomura explicitly discloses that the program chain attribute information corresponds to the program chain information itself. Nonomura does not disclose that the attribute information in any way corresponds to the VOBs identified by the program chain, as asserted by the Examiner, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would not understand the program chains as corresponding to "a group of at least one VOB", which the Examiner construes as corresponding to the at least one title. The program chain includes only a list of VOBs and an order in which the VOBs are to be reproduced (col. 12, lines 5-11). In particular, the program chain includes logical address of the VOBs to be reproduced (col. 12, lines 1-3). The VOBs themselves are in a separate area of the disc, as shown in FIG. 5. The program chain refers to a group of VOBs, but does not include the VOBs. The attribute table thus refers to the program chain, not to the VOBs referenced in the program chain. Accordingly, Nonomura does not disclose attribute information corresponding to at least one title.

In addition, claim 40 recites wherein the title information comprises title access type information indicating whether title search to corresponding title is permitted. However, the attribute table disclosed in Nonomura does not indicate whether the user is able to control the title to be reproduced. The attribute table merely identifies a level ID relating to a parental lock level of the program chain. The attribute table at best indicates whether a user is allowed to view (or access) a particular program chain, not whether a user is allowed to control a particular program chain. The ability to access a program chain is not the same as an ability to control the program chain. Further, as discussed above, the program chain does not correspond to the at least one title as recited in claim 1. Even if the attribute information did indicate whether a user is able to control the program chain, the attribute information would not indicate whether a user is able to control the group of VOBs corresponding to the program chain. The parental lock level of the program chain has nothing to do with individual VOBs or groups of VOBs; indeed, the same VOB (or group of VOBs) can be included in different program chains (col. 12, lines 5-11), which can have different level IDs (col. 12, lines 61-64). Since the attribute information does not correspond to a group of VOBs and does not indicate whether a user is able to control the group of VOBs, Nonomura does not disclose attribute information corresponding to the at least one title and indicating whether a user is able to control one of the at least one title to be reproduced, and thus does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. The rejection of claim 1 should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim 60 depends from claim 40. The rejection of claim 60 should be withdrawn for at

least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 61 depends from claim 52. The rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for the same reasons as those given above with respect to claim 52.

As to claim 52, the Examiner rejected claim 52 for the same reasons as claim 40, and thus the Examiner's rejection of claim 52 stands or falls with the rejection of claim 40. As the rejection of claim 40 should be withdrawn, the rejection of claim 52 should similarly be withdrawn. Claim 54 depends from claim 52; the rejection of claim 54 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 52.

Claims 8-11, 21-24, 46, 48, 50-51, and 55-59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonomura et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,915,067 in view of Kanazawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,580,870. Claims 8-11, 21-24, 46, 48, 50, and 51 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; the rejection of these claims is thus moot. The applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections

Claims 55-59 each depend from claim 52, and incorporate all the limitations of the independent claim 52. As discussed above, Nonomura does not disclose all the limitations of claim 52, and Kanazawa does not remedy the deficiencies identified in Nonomura. Accordingly, the combination of Nonomura and Kanazawa does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claims 55-59, and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the Washington DC office at (202) 216-9505 ext. 235.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 3/18/08

By: G. Clinton
Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510